

THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT
219 South Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois 60604

June 9, 2011

FRANK H. EASTERBROOK
Chief Judge

No. 07-11-90032

IN RE COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDICIAL OFFICER

MEMORANDUM

This is the third complaint (one of them naming two judges) that complainant has filed within the past year under the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act of 1980. All of the complaints assert that the district judge and magistrate judge acted fraudulently when deciding a suit that complainant had filed. The court of appeals affirmed the district court's decision, but complainant refuses to accept defeat.

The prior complaints (Nos. 07-10-90069, -90070, and -90074) all were dismissed on the authority of 28 U.S.C. §352(b)(1)(A)(ii), which provides that any complaint "directly related to the merits of a decision or procedural ruling" must be dismissed. My order in No. 07-10-90074 concluded: "The current complaint does not refer to my order in No. 07-10-90069 or to §352(b)(1)(A)(ii). This complaint is dismissed on the authority of §352(b)(1)(A)(ii). Any future complaint that does not make a serious effort to show how it is compatible with that statute will be dismissed summarily, and I will direct complainant to show cause why the Council should not enter an order curtailing repetitious, frivolous complaints. See Rule 10(a) of the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings."

The current complaint, like that one, does not mention my prior decisions or §352(b)(1)(A)(ii). It does not make a serious, or indeed any, effort to explain how it is compatible with the statute. It is therefore summarily dismissed.

I now give complainant 14 days to show cause why the Council should not enter an order under Rule 10(a) curtailing her ongoing misuse of the 1980 Act's processes.